

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

RUTH KLARIN SILVERMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action 2:20-cv-4553

Judge Sarah D. Morrison

Magistrate Judge Kimberly A. Jolson

ROSSMAN & CO., et. al.,

Defendant.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On September 2, 2020, Plaintiff filed a motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). (Doc. 2). The Supreme Court, in *Adkins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., Inc.*, set forth the legal standard applicable to a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. 335 U.S. 331 (1948). An affidavit of poverty is sufficient if it reflects that the plaintiff cannot pay the Court’s filing fee without depriving herself and her dependents the “necessities of life.” *Id.* at 339 (internal quotation marks omitted). Although the plaintiff need not be totally destitute in order to proceed *in forma pauperis*, paying the filing fee must be more than a mere hardship. *See Foster v. Cuyahoga Dep’t of Health & Human Servs.*, 21 F. App’x 239, 240 (6th Cir. 2001) (noting that “the question is whether the court costs can be paid without undue hardship”). Consequently, unless it is clear that the one-time payment of the Court’s filing fee will render the plaintiff unable to provide for herself and her dependents, the Court cannot grant her *in forma pauperis* status. *See Adkins*, 335 U.S. at 339.

In Plaintiff’s affidavit, she explains that she and her spouse have a combined monthly income of \$5,355, live in a house worth \$232,000, and have no dependents. (*See* Doc. 2 at 2–3). Although, based on her monthly expenses, (*see id.* at 3), it appears that paying the one-time filing

fee would constitute a hardship, it does not appear that it would cause her to be deprived the necessities of life. *See Adkins*, 335 U.S. at 339; *see also Bush v. Ohio Dep't of Rehab. & Corr.*, No. 2:05-CV-0667, 2007 WL 4365381, at *1 (S.D. Ohio Dec. 10, 2007) (noting that “[i]n *forma pauperis* status is usually reserved either for indigent prisoners or for persons who subsist on small fixed-income payments such as social security, unemployment compensation, or public assistance and who would truly be required to forego food, shelter, clothing, or some other necessity were they to devote any of their scant resources to paying a judicial filing fee”). Accordingly, it is **RECOMMENDED** that Plaintiff’s motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. 2) be **DENIED**.

Procedure on Objections

If any party objects to this Report and Recommendation, that party may, within fourteen (14) days of the date of this Report, file and serve on all parties written objections to those specific proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made, together with supporting authority for the objection(s). A Judge of this Court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made. Upon proper objections, a Judge of this Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made herein, may receive further evidence or may recommit this matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The parties are specifically advised that failure to object to the Report and Recommendation will result in a waiver of the right to have the District Judge review the Report and Recommendation *de novo*, and also operates as a waiver of the right to appeal the decision of the District Court adopting the Report and Recommendation. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: September 3, 2020

/s/ Kimberly A. Jolson
KIMBERLY A. JOLSON
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE